

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,207	11/03/2003	David B. Skursha	3206	4179
7590 11/29/2004			EXAMINER	
THE LUBRIZOL CORPORATION			NGHIEM, MICHAEL P	
Patent Administrator - Mail Drop 022B 29400 Lakeland Boulevard			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
_,	Wickliffe, OH 44092-2298		2863	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			16~		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/700,207	SKURSHA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michael P Nghiem	2863			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 N	lovember 2004.				
·_ · · _ · · .					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-4,6-10 and 13-18 i 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) 1,5,11 and 12 is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	s/are withdrawn from considerati	on.			
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>03 November 2003</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine 11.	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	<i></i>		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burear * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicativity documents have been received in Received in PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National Stage			
Amarkan and (a)					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11-3-03.	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species I, Figs. 1-4, in the reply filed on November 4, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all the claims are directed to the on-line monitoring and analysis of a fluid by data or temperature. Therefore, a relationship exists between all the groups of claims. This is not found persuasive because Species I-XII are distinct from each other. For example, Species I, Figs. 1-4, is directed to an invention for determining data-temperature dependence when fluid temperature increases whereas Species II, Figs. 1-3 and 5, is directed to an invention for determining data-temperature dependence when fluid temperature decreases.

Furthermore, Claims 2-4 are directed to an invention that determines data temperature dependence when fluid temperature increases and decreases. This limitation is not described in Species I of Figs. 1-4. However, it is described by Fig. 6 of Species III.

Claim 6 recites that the data collection, temperature dependence determination and use of the determined data temperature-dependence is for at least on data series. This limitation is not described in Species I of Figs. 1-4. However, it is described in Fig. 10 of Species VII.

Application/Control Number: 10/700,207 Page 3

Art Unit: 2863

Claim 7 recites that the data collection, temperature dependence determination and use of the determined data temperature-dependence occurs each time the temperature change criteria are met. This limitation is not described in Species I of Figs. 1-4.

However, it is described in Fig. 13 of Species X.

Claims 8-10 recite outputting information when a data-temperature-dependence is determined. This limitation is not described in Species I of Figs. 1-4. However, it is described in Fig. 12 of Species IX.

Claims 13-18 recite determining if a data temperature-dependence is externally inputted. This limitation is not described in Species I of Figs. 1-4. However, it is described in Fig. 14 of Species XI.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL. Claims 2-4, 6-10, and 13-18 are withdrawn from further consideration

Specification

 The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is required to be corrected to reflect the cancelled drawings: Figs. 5-15.
 Appropriate correction is required. Application/Control Number: 10/700,207

Art Unit: 2863

Claim Objections

Page 4

- 3. Claims 11 and 12 are objected to because of the following informalities:
- claim 11, how can a data temperature dependence be selected from a group of steps (e.g. replacing step)?
- claim 12, the property should be selected from a group of properties. Thus, is, for example, "the determined data temperature dependence alone" a property feature?
- claim 12, "determine" (line 4) should be determined --.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321 may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 5, and 11 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4-6, 11, and 13-15 of copending Application No. 10/271,885 (Lvovich et al., US 2004/0075448).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because Lvovich et al. anticipates the claimed invention:

"A method (claim 1, claim 11) to temperature compensate data of a fluid while in use that comprises:

collecting data (claim 1, claim 11) when fluid temperature changes from a first threshold temperature to at least a second threshold temperature at least at a threshold rate (claim 6, claim 15);

determining the temperature dependence of the collected data (claim 4, claim 13); and,

using the determined data-temperature-dependence for temperature compensating data of the fluid's condition (claim 5, claim 14);

determining at least one of the following selected from the group consisting of: threshold temperature, threshold rate or combinations thereof (claim 6, claim 15);

the determined data-temperature dependence is used for data temperature compensation selected from the group comprising replacing the current data temperature dependence (claim 6, claim 15)."

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35
U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 5, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lvovich et al. (US 2004/0075448).

Regarding claim 1, Lvovich et al. discloses a method (Fig. 2) to temperature compensate data of a fluid while in use (paragraph 0055, lines 14-16) that comprises:

- collecting data (claim 1, lines 8-11) when fluid temperature changes from a first threshold temperature to at least a second threshold temperature at least at a threshold rate (claim 6, lines 4-6);

- determining the temperature dependence of the collected data (claim 4, lines 2-3);

using the determined data-temperature-dependence for temperature compensating data of the fluid's condition (claim 5, lines 1-9).

Regarding claim 5, Lvovich et al. discloses determining at least one of the following selected from the group consisting of: threshold temperature, threshold rate or combinations thereof (claim 6, lines 4-6).

Regarding claim 11, Lvovich et al. discloses replacing the current data-temperature dependence (claim 6, lines 4-5).

Regarding claim 12, Lvovich et al. discloses a property of the determined datatemperature-dependence not being within at least one limit is selected from determined data-temperature dependence alone (paragraph 0105, lines 15-20).

Contact Information

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Nghiem whose telephone number is (571) 272-2277. The examiner can normally be reached on M-H from 6:30AM – 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Barlow can be reached at (571) 272-2269. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

0956.

MICHAEL NGHIEM PRIMARY EXAMINER

Michael Nghiem

November 19, 2004